



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/967,221

09/28/2001

James Morrow

83336.0519

7155

66880 7590 06/09/2008

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, LLP
2121 AVENUE OF THE STARS
SUITE 2800
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER

THOMAS, ERIC M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/09/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kstowe@steptoe.com
emiyake@steptoe.com
jpcody@ballytech.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/967,221	Applicant(s) MORROW ET AL.	
	Examiner Eric M. Thomas	Art Unit 3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-138 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-138 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/25/08 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

This is in response to the amendments filed on 2/25/08; claims 1, 16, 41, 42, 43, 100 – 102, 114, and 135 – 138 have been amended. Claims 1 – 138 are now pending in the current application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 - 138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven et al. (US 5,429,361) in view of Franchi (U.S. 5,770,533) and in further view of Sugiyama (Appl. 09/690,957 filed 10/17/00).

Regarding Claims 1, 16, 20, 41-43, 68-69, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, Raven et al. discloses a gaming machine information, communication, and display system for automating maintenance, accounting, security, player tracking, event recording, player interaction, and other functions for a plurality of gaming machines. The system has a display and data entry means for a player or employee to interact with the system. Furthermore, in addition to gaming functions, the system downloads data from the central data processor to each individual gaming machine. Raven et al. lacks explicitly disclosing; integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming platform screen used to display the gaming information. Raven et al. discloses one way a player or employee interacts with the system is by pressing buttons on a keypad, whereas, in the instant invention, a touch-screen input is utilized to interface with the system. Interaction with a gaming system, whether by keypad input or touch-screen, provides the same function to the overall system. Even though, it was notoriously well know to use touch-screen technology in gaming machines at the time of applicant's invention, Raven is silent on the issue of gaming interface that allows a player to view and participate in the wagering through the display screen and whether the gaming machine produces enhanced graphics and animation display for interactions with the system network. In a related art, however, Sugiyama provides a wagering game that teaches the display of the wagering game including a touch-screen capability, wherein the user is allowed to view and participate in the wagering game through the display screen (col. 4, lines 55 - 63) and provides the gaming machine with the capacity to display multiple

graphical images in the game animations, which results in enhanced and more interactive graphics (fig. 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Sugiyama into the art disclosed by Raven in order to utilizing touch-screen technology into the wagering game, which is attractive to game players and casino personnel and requires less maintenance than mechanical push buttons.

Regarding Claims 6, 38, 65, 74, and 98:

- A Y adapter that allows communication between the display screen and both the at least one processor and the additional processor.

Regarding Claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99:

- calibration software that enables the additional processor to calibrate the display of system information on the display screen.

Regarding Claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, 116:

- the systems interface utilizes touch-screen technology for inputting and accessing system information in the systems network.

Regarding Claims 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, 125:

- the gaming display screen includes a small region that, when selected, activates the system interface.

Regarding Claims 33, 60, 93, and 131:

- the display process that runs the gaming interface supports a graphic user interface based wagering game.

Regarding Claims 36, 63, and 96:

- the converter card utilizes I2C hardware and signaling.

Regarding Claims 40, 67, and 134:

- integrating the systems interface via the display screen lowers overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduces maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts.

Regarding Claims 1, 16, 20, 41, 43, 68, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, Raven is silent on the issue of integrating game-play and service systems into a single interface display. In a related art, however, Franchi provides a system that discloses a systems interface that is incorporated into the display screen of the gaming device that displays non – gaming system information from the casino system network that allows the player of the gaming machine to input requests into the network from the systems interface through the gaming machine. Therefore, it would have been obvious to integrate the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display the gaming information. One would be motivated to integrate the gaming and service systems into one display system in order to modernize an existing system to the present state of technology. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention to make Raven's gaming and maintenance interface systems integral on a single platform. One would be motivated to do so because integrating systems is well within known

standard engineering guidelines, practices, and principles. See MPEP § 2144.04.

Regarding Claims 6, 38, 65, 74, and 98, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, utilizing a Y adapter to allow communication to a plurality of devices was well known. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to utilize a Y adapter that allows communication between the display screen and both the at least one processor and the additional processor. One would be motivated to utilize a Y adapter to allow communication between the display and one of the processors because a Y adapter provides a simple solution to switching communication from one processor to the other, thereby, allowing the system to eliminate at least one redundant connection between the display and one of the processors.

Regarding Claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, calibration software and hardware for a computer display were notoriously well known in the art.

Regarding Claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, 116, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, touch-screen technology was well known. It would have been obvious to modernize Raven et al. with a systems interface utilizing touch-screen technology for inputting and accessing system information in the systems network. One would be motivated to utilize touch-screen technology in a gaming and

Art Unit: 3714

servicing system in order to bring up to date an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding Claims 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, 125, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, providing a gaming display screen including a small region (icon or GUI button) that, when selected, activates the system interface is notoriously well known in the art. One would be motivated to use an icon or GUI button on a display screen to activate a particular system in order to update an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding Claims 33, 60, 93, and 131, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, the display process that runs the gaming interface supporting a graphic user interface based wagering game is notoriously well known in the gaming art.

Regarding Claims 36, 63, and 96, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to use existing engineering guidelines to update existing converter card hardware and signaling with I2C hardware and signaling. One would be motivated to do so in order to revise an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding Claims 40, 67, and 134, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, it would have been obvious that integrating the systems interface via the display screen would lower overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduce maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts. Reducing

Art Unit: 3714

overall costs by eliminating hardware and reducing maintenance costs are a byproduct of modernizing an existing system to the present state of technology.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims, 1, 16, 41, 42, 43, 100 – 102, 114, and 135 – 138 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric M. Thomas whose telephone number is (571) 272-1699. The examiner can normally be reached on 7a.m. - 3p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert E Pezzuto/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714